

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

David Wayne Warrick,	)	C/A No. 8:13-242-JMC-KFM
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b>Report and Recommendation</b>
vs.	)	
	)	
Randy Doran; Phil Ireland; Edgefield County)	)	
Sheriffs Office,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

Plaintiff David Wayne Warrick ("Plaintiff") files this case *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff alleges Defendants defamed and falsely arrested him and seeks monetary compensation. As Defendant Edgefield County Sheriff's Office is not amenable to suit, that defendant should be dismissed as a party to this suit.

*Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review*

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; and the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). The complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted" or is "frivolous or malicious."

---

<sup>1</sup>Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) DSC, the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31. Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995).

This court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999), or construct the plaintiff's legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), or “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990).

#### Background and Discussion

Plaintiff alleges that he was falsely arrested by defendants, which also led to him being defamed. In South Carolina, a sheriff's department is an agency of the state, not a

department under the control of the county. See *Carroll v. Greenville County Sheriff's Dep't*, 871 F.Supp. 844, 846 (D.S.C.1994) (suit against the sheriff's office is suit against the state); see also *Edwards v. Lexington Cnty. Sheriff's Department*, 688 S.E.2d 125, 127 n. 1 (S.C. 2010) (“[U]nder South Carolina law, the sheriff and sheriff's deputies are State, not county, employees.”). As an agency of the state, Defendant Edgefield County Sheriff's Office is immune from suit under the Eleventh Amendment. *Stewart v. Beaufort County*, 481 F.Supp.2d. 483, 492 (D.S.C.2007) (“[A] federal court lacks jurisdiction to hear a cause of action against a South Carolina Sheriff's Department, as such a suit is barred by state immunity.”). Under *Pennhurst State School & Hospital v. Halderman*, a state must expressly consent to suit in a federal district court. 465 U.S. 89, 98 (1984). The state of South Carolina has not consented to suit in a federal court. See S.C. Code Ann. § 15-78-20(e)(1976)(statute expressly provides that the state of South Carolina does not waive Eleventh Amendment immunity, consents to suit only in a court of the state of South Carolina, and does not consent to suit in a federal court or in a court of another state). Thus, because Defendant Edgefield County Sheriff's Office is immune from suit under the Eleventh Amendment, the case against this Defendant should be dismissed.

#### Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the case against defendant Edgefield County Sheriff's Office *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

s/ Kevin F. McDonald  
United States Magistrate Judge

March 12, 2013  
Greenville, South Carolina

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
300 East Washington Street, Room 239  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).